

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Thane M. Larson et al.

Serial No.: 09/923,747

Filing Date: August 7, 2001

Docket No.: 10012577-1

Title: LCD PANEL FOR A SERVER SYSTEM

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Non-Final Office Action mailed March 27, 2003. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-7, and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallagher et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,157,534 ("Gallagher") in view of Jindrick et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,964,017 ("Jindrick"). Further, claims 5 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallagher in view of Jindrick, and further in view of Potter et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,809,262 ("Potter").

With this Response, claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 12, and 14, have been amended, claim 11 has been cancelled, and claims 19-24 have been added. It is believed that all claims are now in a condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested. With this Response, typographical errors on page 4 of the specification have been corrected.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-7, and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallagher (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,534) in view of Jindrick (U.S. Patent No. 4,964,017). Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation "the first LCD panel including a user selectable lockout mechanism for controlling access to the server management card". With respect to dependent claims 6 and 7, the Examiner stated that:

Gallagher et al. in view of Jindrick et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for a lock out key being provided and lockout status indication being provided.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to include a lockout key and status indication on the server of Gallagher et al. in view of Jindrick et al. for the purpose of preventing unauthorized users from accessing the server. (Office Action at p. 3).

The Examiner has acknowledged that the cited references do not disclose a lockout key. Gallagher and Jindrick, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the use of a lockout key or other lockout mechanism on an LCD panel of a server system for controlling access to a server management card. The Applicants respectfully request in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 2144.03 that the Examiner cite a reference to teach the further limitations of claim 1.

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Thane M. Larson et al.

Serial No.: 09/923,747

Filing Date: August 7, 2001

Docket No.: 10012577-1

Title: LCD PANEL FOR A SERVER SYSTEM

In view of the above, independent claim 1 as amended is not taught or suggested by Gallagher and/or Jindrick. In addition, dependent claims 2-4 and 6-7, which further limit patentably distinct claim 1, are also believed to be allowable over the cited references. Allowance of claims 1-4 and 6-7 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallagher in view of Jindrick, and further in view of Potter (U.S. Patent No. 5,809,262). It should be noted first that, like Gallagher and Jindrick, Potter also does not teach or suggest the use of a lockout mechanism for controlling access to a server management card as claimed in claim 1. Thus, dependent claims 5 and 8, which further limit patentably distinct claim 1, are also believed to be allowable over the cited references.

Claims 5 and 8 are also further distinguishable over the cited references. The Examiner stated that "Gallagher et al. in view of Jindrick et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for a redundant display being provided on the server The prior art shown in figure 1 of Potter et al. disclose a primary and a redundant display being provided [28, 48] in a server." (Office Action at pp. 3-4). The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of Potter. The two displays 28 and 48 in Figure 1 of Potter are for two separate computer systems that are physically located in two separate locations, and that are connected together via an external physical link 78:

A first computer system 10, typically housed within a first computer chassis 11 and physically located at a first location Also residing on the PCI bus 20 [of computer system 10] are plural peripheral devices such as . . . a display system 28, for example, a video monitor, which visually displays data.

. . . .

As illustrated herein, the second computer system 12 is housed within a second computer chassis 13, physically located at a second location and configured identically to the first computer system 10, i.e. the second computer system 12 is comprised of . . . a PCI bus 42 on which . . . a display system 48 . . . reside

. . . .

Finally, physical interconnection between the first computer system 10 and the second computer system 12 is achieved using a physical link 78 which connects the first serial I/O port 68 and the second serial I/O port 76. For example, the physical link 78 may be coaxial cable or twisted-pair wires.

(See, e.g., Potter at col. 2, lines 25-27 and lines 60-65; col. 3, lines 16-23 and lines 59-64).

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Thane M. Larson et al.

Serial No.: 09/923,747

Filing Date: August 7, 2001

Docket No.: 10012577-1

Title: LCD PANEL FOR A SERVER SYSTEM

Thus, displays 28 and 48 in Potter are not displays for a single server, but rather are displays for two separate computer systems in two separate locations. In contrast, claim 8, for example, includes the limitation "wherein the first LCD panel is mounted on a front panel of the server system, the server system further comprising a second LCD panel substantially similar to the first LCD panel mounted on a back panel of the server system."

In view of the above, dependent claims 5 and 8 are not taught or suggested by Gallagher, Jindrick, and Potter, either alone or in combination. In addition, dependent claims 5 and 8 further limit patentably distinct claim 1, and are believed to be allowable over the cited references. Allowance of claims 5 and 8 is respectfully requested.

With respect to method claims 9-14, the Examiner stated that "the claimed method steps would have been necessitated by the product structure." (Office Action at p. 3). Independent claim 9 has been amended to include the limitation "providing first and second LCD panels mounted on the computer system and coupled to the management card". Gallagher and Jindrick do not teach or suggest the use of two LCD panels as claimed in claim 9. And as described above with respect to claims 5 and 8, the two displays 28 and 48 in Figure 1 of Potter are for two separate computer systems that are physically located in two separate locations. Potter does not teach or suggest the use of two LCD panels mounted on the same computer system and coupled to the same management card as claimed in amended claim 9.

In view of the above, independent claim 9 as amended is not taught or suggested by the cited references. In addition, dependent claims 10-14, which further limit patentably distinct claim 9, are also believed to be allowable over the cited references. Allowance of claims 9-14 is respectfully requested.

Newly Presented Claims

With this Amendment, the Applicants have submitted new claims 19-24. Claims 19-21 are dependent on independent method claim 9. As described above, independent claim 9 is not taught or suggested by the cited references. Since dependent claims 19-21 further limit patentably distinct claim 9, claims 19-21 are also believed to be allowable over the cited references. Allowance of claims 19-21 is respectfully requested.

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Thane M. Larson et al.

Serial No.: 09/923,747

Filing Date: August 7, 2001

Docket No.: 10012577-1

Title: LCD PANEL FOR A SERVER SYSTEM

New independent claim 22 is directed to a server system, and includes the limitations "a first LCD panel mounted on a first side of the chassis and coupled to the server management card; and a second LCD panel mounted on a second side of the chassis and coupled to the server management card." As described above, the cited references do not teach or suggest the use of two LCD panels mounted on the same server and coupled to the same management card. In view of the above, independent claim 22 is not taught or suggested by the cited references. In addition, dependent claims 23-24, which further limit patentably distinct claim 22, are also believed to be allowable over the cited references. Allowance of claims 22-24 is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

In light of the above, Applicant believes independent claims 1, 9, and 22, and the claims depending therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Jeff A. Holmen at Telephone No. (612) 573-0178, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005 or David M. Mason at Telephone No. (408) 447-4046, Facsimile No. (408) 447-0854. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Thane M. Larson et al.

Serial No.: 09/923,747

Filing Date: August 7, 2001

Docket No.: 10012577-1

Title: LCD PANEL FOR A SERVER SYSTEM

Hewlett-Packard Company

Intellectual Property Administration

P.O. Box 272400

Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Thane M. Larson et al.,

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC

Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250

100 South Fifth Street

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 573-0178

Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: 6/5/03

JAH:jmc

Jeff A. Holmen

Reg. No. 38,492

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8:

The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope address to: **Box Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450** on this 5th day of June, 2003.

By Jeff A. Holmen

Name: Jeff A. Holmen